

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,564	12/05/2003	Steve D. Huseth	P03.0493 (H0006281-0760)	8890
75	90 04/27/2006	EXAMINER		
HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.			ZIMMERMAN, BRIAN A	
Law Dept. AB2				
P.O. Box 2245		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Morristown, NJ 07962-9806			2612	•
			DATE MAILED: 04/27/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Арр	lication No.	Applicant(s	;)			
Office Action Summary		10/	728,564	HUSETH ET	HUSETH ET AL.			
		Exa	miner	Art Unit				
		Bria	n A. Zimmerman	2612				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOI CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAI nsions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commun period for reply is specified above, the maximum statur re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will reply received by the Office later than three months afte and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE (37 CFR 1.136(a). In ication. lory period will apply I, by statute, cause	OF THIS COMMUN in no event, however, may y and will expire SIX (6) MO the application to become a	ICATION. The reply be timely filed ENTHS from the mailing date of the part of	of this communication.			
Status								
	Responsive to communication(s) filed This action is FINAL . 2b Since this application is in condition fo closed in accordance with the practice)⊠ This actio r allowance ex	cept for formal ma	<u>.</u>				
Dispositi	on of Claims							
5) □ 6) ⊠ 7) □ 8) □ Applicati 9) □ 10) □	Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the appear of the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction on Papers The specification is objected to by the Entry drawing(s) filed on is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to be	examiner. accepted on to the drawing ecorrection is a	tion requirement. or b) objected to g(s) be held in abeya required if the drawin	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85 g(s) is objected to. See	37 CFR 1.121(d).			
	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119	•						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
2) 🔲 Notice 3) 🔯 Inform	(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT- No(s)/Mail Date 11/18/05.		Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application 	n (PTO-152)			

THE SALE OF THE PARTY OF THE PA

THE PARTY COUNTY OF THE STREET STREET, STREET,

TOTAL STATE OF THE STATE OF THE

Application/Control Number: 10/728,564

Art Unit: 2612

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claim 1 recites the limitation "keybob" in the last line of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is assumed this is merely a typo, and the interpretation given for consideration of art is a "keyfob."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

e) the invention was described in — (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the inven-tion by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language;

1. Claims 1,2,7,13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Berardi (2003/0167207).

Berardi shows a method for providing access to a financial transaction, where the system includes two versions of the transponder 102. The first embodiment of transponder 102 does not include a fingerprint reader (figure 2); this is interpreted as a badge. The second embodiment of transponder 102

BALL down and the transmitted by the state of the state o

includes a fingerprint reader (figure 9), this is interpreted as a keyfob. The figure 9 transponder sends the fob ID (stored in memory 214) with the fingerprint so both can be authenticated. When the data is read from the transponder, a comparison is made to authorize financial access; this meets the limitation of determining if the received code is authentic and providing access upon authentication. If the data is from a badge, the authorization step compares account data (or the transponder ID), paragraph 59. If the data is from a keyfob the authorization step compares fingerprint data, paragraph 141. It is the examiner's position that in order to compare the received data from the figure 9 transponder with stored fingerprint data, a decision inherently is made that the data received includes fingerprint data. This meets the limitation of determining if the code is from a badge or keyfob.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 4,5,8,10,11,15,16,18,20,22,23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berardi (2003/0167207) as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Fuku (6868170).

THE PARTY OF THE P

Berardi shows a method for providing access where the system includes two versions of the transponder 102. Berardi shows fingerprint data being compared, but does not exactly teach a specific method or apparatus to perform such function.

In an analogous art, Fuku shows a security system that extracts fingerprint data from a sensor 11 and converts the fingerprint data into digital data 12 that can be compared to data in a storage unit 13 for access authorization. This converting a comparing allows for easy processing of the fingerprint authentication process. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the fingerprint authorization process (and elements) in the Berardi system since it would provide processing of the desired fingerprint authorization of Berardi.

3. Claims 3,6,9,12,17,19,21,24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berardi and Fuku as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Fitzgibbon (2003/0210131).

In an analogous art Fitzgibbon teaches an access security system where a transmitter can send codes to a garage door for access authorization. The portable transmitter can additionally include a fingerprint reader to send information regarding the user's fingerprint, also for authorization. Fitzgibbon is cited for teaching that in this type of system, the use of rolling codes can improve the security of the system. See figure 5.

- in a party of the same and

THE PARTY OF THE PROPERTY OF T

Art Unit: 2612

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used rolling codes in the above modified system since rolling codes can increase the security of an access system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian A. Zimmerman whose telephone number is 571-272-3059. The examiner can normally be reached on 7 am to 4 pm E.S.T.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber can be reached on 571-272-7308. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Briar A Zimmerman Primary Examiner Art Unit 2612